REMARKS

Please replace original page 68 of the English translation of the PCT application submitted for entrance to the national stage in the U.S., with the enclosed replacement page 68.

Subsequent to the outstanding Office Action of July 18, 2003, it was discovered that claim 18 on page 68 of the English translation of the PCT application submitted for entrance to the U.S. national stage was mistranslated from the original Japanese text, in that the phrase "and an electrolytic salt" at the end of claim 18 was omitted. As a result of this error, original claims 17 and 18 appeared to be identical leading to the cancellation of claim 17 and the amendment of claim 18 in the Preliminary Amendment of March 15, 2001 as if it were the same as original claim 17. However, since the latter actions on claims 17 and 18 were both based on an erroneous translation of claim 18 which has now been corrected in the replacement page 68, the cancellation of claim 17 and previously amendment of claim 18 are believed to be inapplicable and the present amendment of claims 17 and 18 are based on these claims as they existed before the Preliminary Amendment of March 15, 2001.

All the foregoing amendments of the claims are believed to be consistent with positions expressed in the outstanding Office Action and self-explanatory.

Claims 1, 3, 10-16, 18-20 and 29-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph on the ground that they are broader than the enabling disclosure since, as recited in independent claim 1, such claims are not limited to a trivalent or tetravalent boron containing polymer. The Office Action also subsequently objects to claims 2, 5, 6 and 22 as being dependent on a rejected base claim but states that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is assumed that claim 13 would also be allowable if put in independent form since no rejection of this claim was made based on prior art.

It is submitted that the forgoing rejection is overcome by the cancellation of claims 1, 10-12 and 21 and the amendment of former dependent claims 2, 5, 6, 13 and 22 to put them in independent form. It is noted that each of the latter claims inherently contains all the limitations of its independent claim before it was amended. With this amendment, all the remaining claims which were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, are now believed to be allowable, either because they were amended to put them in independent form or because they are dependent on such an allowable claim.

Claims 3 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite since they are stated to rely on the polymeric formula in claim 1 or 2 although claim 1 does not contain any formula. This rejection is believed

to be overcome by the above amendment which cancels claim 1, amends claim 2 to put it in independent form and thus allowable, and amends claim 3 and 4 so that they depend solely on claim 2.

Claims 1, 3, 18-20 and 29-31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Angell et al. (WO 97/16862). It is submitted that the foregoing amendment overcomes this rejection by cancelling claim 1, amending claims 2, 5, 6 and 13 to put them in independent form and thus allowable, and amending claims 3, 18, 29 and 30 so that they are dependent solely on allowable claims. With this amendment, all the claims are either in independent form and thus allowable, or are directly or indirectly dependent on allowable independent claims and are therefore also allowable.

Claims 1, 3, 21 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishikitani et al. (JP 8-273253). This rejection is believed to be overcome by the cancellation of claims 1 and 21, the amendment of claim 3 to be dependent solely on claim 2, the amendment of claim 25 to be dependent on claims 22-24, and the amendment of claims 2 and 22 to put them in independent and therefore allowable form.

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tatsuo et al (JP 1154151). It is believed that this rejection is

overcome by the foregoing amendment for reasons stated in the previous paragraph concerning the rejection based on Nishikitani et al.

Claims 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nishikitani et al. (JP 8-273653) in view of Kono et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,019,908). It is submitted that this rejection is overcome by the amendment of claim 26 to be dependent on claim 18, the amendment of claim 18 to be dependent on any one of claims 2, 5, 6 and 13 and the amendment of the latter four claims to put them in independent and therefore allowable form.

This application is now thought to be in condition for allowance and such action at an early date is earnestly solicited.

A one month extension of time is hereby requested for which please charge the government fee of $110.00 to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to the same deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By _____
C. Bruce Hamburg
Reg. No. 22,389
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340

Enc: Replacement Page 68

OIPE
NOV 21 2003
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED
DEC 01 2003
TECH CENTER 1600/2900

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

the following formula (4), p represents an integer of 0 to 38,000, and q represents an integer of 0 to 28,000, provided p and q are not 0 at the same time.

$-CH_2-[-CH_2CH_2O-]_r-Ra$ formula (4)

wherein r represents 0 or an integer of 1 or more, and Ra represents a methyl group, an ethyl group, a propyl group or a butyl group.

16 The ion-conductive polymeric compound according to any one of claims 13 to 15, characterized in that R^{11} and R^{12} in general formula (9) are one or more selected from the group consisting of an alkyl group, an aryl group, derivatives thereof and fluorine-substituted derivatives thereof.

17. A polymeric electrolyte using one or more types of the ion-conductive polymeric compound according to any one of claims 1 to 16.

RECEIVED
DEC 03 2003
TC 1700

18. A polymeric electrolyte comprising one or more types of the ion-conductive polymeric compound according to any one of claims 1 to 16, and an electrolytic salt.

19. The polymeric electrolyte according to claim 18, characterized by further comprising a nonaqueous solvent.

20. The polymeric electrolyte according to claim 19, characterized in that the nonaqueous solvent is an aprotic solvent.

21. A polymeric electrolyte comprising a polymeric compound having a tetravalent boron atom in a polymeric